

REMARKS

Prior to the present amendment, claims 1-10 were pending. Claims 11-17 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in allowable form.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner required a new title of the invention, which is indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. In response, Applicant has amended the title of the invention to indicate that a photographing apparatus has a display for display of a network. It is respectfully submitted that the amended title sufficiently describes the invention to which the claims are directed and fully complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.72.

The Office Action includes a rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Patent Application Publication No US 2001/0019359 to *Parulski et al.* (hereinafter, "*Parulski*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention, as broadly embodied in claim 1, is directed to a photographing apparatus connectable to a network to which a plurality of image processing apparatuses are connected via cables or by wireless. The photographing apparatus includes an interface for connecting the apparatus to the network, a display for displaying a network structure, and an operation unit for allowing image data taken by the photographing apparatus to be processed in the network.

Exemplary embodiments of the present invention generate a network structure on a display of a photographing apparatus. For example, as shown in Figs. 7(b), 8(b), 9(b), 10(a)-10(c), 14 and 15, and disclosed on pages 16-19 of the specification, the display 10 includes an image 1003 of a network structure, which includes displaying indicia (e.g., icons) representing devices currently connected in a network (e.g., PC1, PC2, PC3, a mouse and a printer Pri). By displaying a network structure on a display of a photographic apparatus, as claimed, presently connected nodes of the network become known to a user of the apparatus. For example, while viewing the display of the connected nodes, a user is allowed to select among resources located at any one of the displayed nodes.

The Examiner asserts that *Parulski* discloses an interface for selecting at least one e-mail address, and that this operation of selecting an available e-mail allegedly "constitutes displaying of the network structure." (See the Office Action, page 2, the last line to page 3,

line 2.) Applicant disputes any allegation that the operation of selecting a displayed e-mail constitutes *a display for a network structure* in the context in which this feature is recited in claim 1. Moreover, *Parulski* does not even appear to disclose displaying actual e-mail addresses.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, *Parulski* does not mention or suggest displaying an e-mail addresses itself. The camera disclosed in *Parulski* merely displays one or more keyword descriptors that point to respective e-mail addresses. In fact, *Parulski* discloses that e-mail addresses are linked with a name, such as Grandma, John, a boss name or a client name in an application running on a host PC application. After entering this information into the PC application program, it is downloaded to a memory card or internal memory of a camera. (See *Parulski*, ¶¶ [0022][0023] and Figure 2.) According to *Parulski*, the camera displays the keyword descriptors for selection by the user. A user selected keyword descriptor causes information corresponding to the descriptor, such as an e-mail address to be collected into a "utilization file." (See *Parulski*, ¶ [0027].) However, none of the keyword descriptors disclosed in *Parulski* pertain to a network structure as claimed. Hence, *Parlusk*i does not disclose *a display for displaying a network structure*, as alleged by the Examiner.

Even if one were to consider, *arguendo*, that *Parulski* somehow discloses actually displaying e-mail addresses, this hypothetical disclosure cannot reasonably be interpreted to meet the claimed feature of *a display for displaying a network structure* in the context that it is claimed. An e-mail address is generally in the form of "name.domain," in which "name" designates the name associated with a message account and the "domain" designates a network location of the account associated with the name. At best, a viewer of an e-mail address may infer where the address is generally located (e.g., fr = France, uk = United Kingdom), and/or what sort of organization is associated with the address (e.g., com = a commercial organization and edu = educational organization). However, displayed e-mail addresses do not connote, nor do they suggest, *a displayed network structure*. A *network* includes at least two connected components. By contrast, the plurality of e-mail addresses described in *Parulski* are not connected in any way within the meaning of a network (e.g., what network connection does "Grandma" make with the "Boss," "Client," or "John"?).

With respect to anticipation, M.P.E.P. § 2131 instructs: "To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. 'A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.' *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). 'The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.' *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)." For at least the reasons given above, *Parulski* fails to disclose the combination of each and every feature recited in claim 1. Hence, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established. As such, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Each of claims 4, 6 and 9 similarly recite *a display for displaying a network structure*, and are therefore patentably distinguished from *Parulski* at least for the reasons given above for claim 1, and further for the additional points of distinction defined therein. For example, both claims 4 and 9 recite *an operation unit for executing a program recorded in each image processing apparatus connected to the network*. The Examiner asserts that *Parulski* discloses this feature in ¶ [0021] because a microprocessor in the camera allegedly causes execution of e-mail programs in computers connected to the network. The undersigned has read ¶ [0021] in *Parulski*, but could not find this alleged disclosure. Moreover, it is not clear to the undersigned how an e-mail program in a PC is necessarily executed by the camera disclosed in *Parulski* by simply sending an e-mail. That is, it would appear that an e-mail program on a receiving device (e.g., on Grandma's computer or the service provider's computer) is executed by the operator, and not in response to receiving an e-mail. In any event, this feature does not appear to be either explicitly or inherently disclosed in *Parulski*.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10 each depend from one of claims 1, 4, 6 and 9, and are therefore believed patentable at least for the above reasons, and further for the additional features they each recite.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present patent application is in condition for allowance. An early indication of the allowability of the present patent application is therefore respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: _____


John F. Guay

Registration No. 47,248

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: March 21, 2003

Attachment to Amendment Dated March 21, 2003, Showing Changes to the Title

The title of the invention has been amended as follows:

-- PHOTOGRAPHIC APPARATUS HAVING DISPLAY FOR DISPLAY OF A
NETWORK AND NETWORK SYSTEM --.